



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

even though it is uncertain whether the Arcadians actually accented it so or as *πριακάσιος*. And just as much uncertainty exists in the case of many other forms which the author does not leave unaccented, e. g., in words in *-ηος*, where it is impossible to determine, for most dialects, when the older *-ήιος* passed into *-ήιος*, but which the author uniformly accents in accordance with the later, diphthongal pronunciation of *η*, even in the earliest inscriptions, as Ion. *φουνικῆμα*, *Τήην*, *Τήων* (No. 42; in the first edition *φουνικῆμα*, but inconsistently *Τήην*, etc.), which other editors accent *φουνικῆῖα*, *Τήῆην*, etc. (cf. *Τήυοι*, *θωυήν* in contemporaneous inscriptions).

There are several matters of accentuation and reading which I should like to discuss, but the space at my disposal forbids.

CARL DARLING BUCK

Johannes Scotus. VON E. K. RAND. München: Beck, 1906.
Pp. xiv+106. M. 6.

In this second instalment of Traube's *Quellen und Untersuchungen* Rand admirably fulfils the ideals which he himself set forth, with a gracious tribute to the editor-in-chief, in Vol. I, p. 429, of this journal, in welcoming the series. He has prepared a critical edition of a ninth-century commentary on Boethius' *Opuscula sacra*, and by careful and cogent reasoning ascribes it with every probability to Johannes Scotus himself. Traube's preface points out the varied aspect of text transmission in the Middle Ages; the new light thrown on Boethius' and Scotus' relations to mediaeval thought; and the probable connection of Scotus with Otto III and Henry II, through Gerbert, Hincmar, and the learned circle at Reims—an illustration of the value of paleographical detail for literary history, since it is the insular handwriting in the margin of a Reims MS of Boethius which determines the reasoning. In closing, Traube urges the need of a new edition of Scotus' works.

The commentary itself had been known in part through the extracts published in Peiper's Boethius (1871); and Usener ascribed it in 1877 to a period antedating Scotus. Schepss, however, noted in 1885 that the work refers to a letter from Pope Nicholas I (867) calling Formosus (who became pope in 871) bishop; thus it is contemporary with the Irish philosopher. Rand defends its importance against the slurs of earlier critics, who knew it only in part. Its author's Greek glosses are uniformly correct. He shows much grammatical acumen, noting, e. g., that Boethius' use of *est* after *non quo* is a Graecism (he himself uses the subjunctive in this construction). He quotes several times from the Fathers, especially Augustine; but classical reminiscences are rare, though he does locate in the *Tusculan Disputations* an *optime dictum* cited by Boethius without

designation of author. Theologically, he impresses one as an independent disciple of Augustine.

Scotus' fame rests, of course, on his activity as philosopher and translator. We had, to be sure, his commentary on the Pseudo-Dionysius, bits of that on the Gospel of John; Hauréau has published glosses to book iv of Martianus Capella in which the internal evidence of Scotus' authorship is corroborated by Remigius of Auxerre, who expressly ascribes them to him. Rand devotes an interesting appendix to this proof, and then, in the second part of his dissertation, shows that Remigius made use of Johannes' commentary on Boethius as the basis of one of his own, which has come down to us both independently and fused with its original.

Since it is clear that Scotus was both a philosopher and a commentator, it is a priori probable that he should have commented on Boethius, whose works constituted a "required course" in the mediaeval curriculum. We find him using Boethius' arithmetic; he calls him "magnificus Boethius." A Laurentian MS containing several lives of the latter introduces one with the words "verba Iohannis Scoti incipiunt." Rand parallels passages from this commentary with similar ones from undoubted works of Scotus; and in two longer extracts, the phraseology and imagery are so similar as to compel the assumption of a common origin. Resemblances to Heiricus of Auxerre seem to Rand of no significance; it is indeed unlikely that the latter's humanistic tendencies could fail to appear in any commentary he might write; while Scotus is throughout chary of classical reminiscence. Differences of theological position Rand would explain by Johannes' desire to avoid the suspicion of heresy, which overtook him after all; and he would therefore assign the tractate to the later years of the great Irish thinker.

For his edition Rand takes a Corbie ninth-century MS, now in Paris, as the basis; he uses also eight others, reaching to the twelfth century, when fuller commentaries came in. The text occupies about 50 pages of the treatise; Rand adds extracts from a later commentary on *Tractatus* iv, not in Johannes' MS of Boethius; this commentary he assigns to Heiricus' pupil, Remigius of Auxerre.

Altogether apart, therefore, from its technical value to the student of philosophy and theology and to the Latinist, Rand has here disclosed a chapter in literary history which amplifies in a welcome manner our knowledge of the Caroline renaissance and the relations and interests of its scholars. It is a pleasure to praise the typography of the book, and to note that the German is called "vortrefflich" by Manilius.

CHARLES UPSON CLARK